

# In the United States Court of Federal Claims

## OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 21-1383V

UNPUBLISHED

TINA PAXSON,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND  
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: January 24, 2023

Special Processing Unit (SPU);  
Ruling on Entitlement; Concession;  
Table Injury; Tetanus Diphtheria  
acellular Pertussis (Tdap) Vaccine;  
Shoulder Injury Related to Vaccine  
Administration (SIRVA)

*Laura Levenberg, Muller Brazil, LLP, Dresher, PA, for Petitioner.*

*Julia Marter Collison, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.*

### **RULING ON ENTITLEMENT**<sup>1</sup>

On May 21, 2021, Tina Paxson filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*<sup>2</sup> (the “Vaccine Act”). Petitioner alleges that she suffered a shoulder injury related to vaccine administration (SIRVA) resulting from the tetanus diphtheria acellular pertussis (Tdap) vaccine she received on August 5, 2020. Petition at 1. Petitioner further alleges that the vaccination was administered within the United States, her SIRVA symptoms persisted for more than six months, and neither Petitioner nor any other party has ever filed any action or received compensation in the form of award or settlement for her vaccine-related injury. Petition at 1, 3. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

---

<sup>1</sup> Because this unpublished Ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims' website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the Ruling will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

<sup>2</sup> National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all section references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

On January 19, 2023, Respondent filed his Rule 4(c) report in which he concedes that Petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report at 1. Specifically, Respondent determined that "[P]etitioner had no history of pain, inflammation or dysfunction in her left shoulder; her pain and reduced range of motion occurred within 48 hours of receipt of an intramuscular vaccination; her symptoms were limited to the shoulder in which the vaccine was administered; and no other condition or abnormality was identified to explain her symptoms." *Id.* at 3. Respondent further agrees that the case was timely filed, that the vaccine was received in the United States, and that "[P]etitioner satisfies the statutory severity requirement by suffering the residual effects or complications of her injury for more than six months after vaccine administration. Petitioner also avers that she has not filed a civil action for alleged vaccine-related injuries and has not received compensation in the form of an award or civil settlement for alleged vaccine-related injury." *Id.* Respondent conceded that entitlement to compensation is appropriate in this case under the terms of the Vaccine Act. *Id.* at 4.

**In view of Respondent's position and the evidence of record, I find that Petitioner is entitled to compensation.**

**IT IS SO ORDERED.**

**s/Brian H. Corcoran**

Brian H. Corcoran  
Chief Special Master